UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/642,879	08/18/2003	David Morrow	WLI 1063 PUS	3318
59582 7590 10/17/2007 DICKINSON WRIGHT PLLC 38525 WOODWARD AVENUE			EXAMINER	
			CHAMBERS, MICHAEL S	
SUITE 2000 BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48304-2970		)	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	·		3711	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/17/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	•	Je s				
1	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
055' 4-4' 0	10/642,879	MORROW ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Mike Chambers	3711				
The MAILING DATE of this comm Period for Reply	unication appears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address				
<ul> <li>Failure to reply within the set or extended period for re</li> </ul>	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC ons of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re ommunication.  In statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT eply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABA hs after the mailing date of this communication, even if times.	CATION.  Sply be timely filed  IHS from the mailing date of this communication.  ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s)	filed on 10 August 2007					
2a)☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> .	2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 41-51 is/are pending in the day Of the above claim(s) is 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ⊠ Claim(s) 41-51 is/are rejected.  7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to solution are subject to reserve	s/are withdrawn from consideration.	•				
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by	the Examiner.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
	bjection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyand	• •				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) includ  11) The oath or declaration is objected	ing the correction is required if the drawing(s I to by the Examiner. Note the attached	- ·				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul><li>2. Certified copies of the priori</li><li>3. Copies of the certified copie</li><li>application from the Interna</li></ul>	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	oplication No received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	_					
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/0-Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>	(PTO-948) Paper No(s)	ummary (PTO-413) )/Mail Date formal Patent Application 				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)

Art Unit: 3711

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by HauteStick. HauteStick discloses a hollow tube having an interior surface and an exterior surface and extending a length along a longitudinal axis between a first end and a second end wherein one of said first and second ends is operable for attachment to a lacrosse head and said hollow tube having a wall thickness defined in a plane normal to said longitudinal axis between said interior surface and said exterior surface, wherein said wall thickness varies about said longitudinal axis in said plane and includes a first range

Art Unit: 3711

about said longitudinal axis of relatively thicker wall thickness and a second range about said longitudinal axis of relatively thinner wall thickness, said first range and said second range operably associated with one another whereby said hollow tube is operable to provide tactile feedback to a user of said hollow tube as to the orientation of said hollow tube in the user's hand (See NPL HauteStick pgs 1-5).

Claims 41- 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morrow et al (5568925) in view of Merola (3697069) and HauteStick. Morrow discloses a hollow shaft (fig 1, 3:46-49). HauteStick discloses it is old to desire to strengthen a portion of the shaft to increase its strength for checking the user's opponent (page 4). Merola discloses an eccentric shaft (fig 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have employed the eccentric cross sectional shape of Merola with Morrow in order to increase the strength of the shaft for checking during play.

As to claims 42 and 43: Merola discloses a substantially constant wall thickness with a first range of at least 120-180 degrees (fig 5). Note: The specification provides no unexpected or surprising results in using limitation; therefore it is considered a design choice. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have selected any one of several first ranges based on the design criteria of the machines making the extruded shafts.

As to claim 44: The specification provides no unexpected or surprising results in using limitation; therefore it is considered a design choice. An eccentric shaft having a hexagonal cross sectional shape would naturally have multiple ranges of thicknesses.

Art Unit: 3711

As to claim 45: Merola discloses a substantially constant wall thickness around a first and second range (fig 5).

As to claims 46-48: The specification provides no unexpected or surprising results in using these limitations; therefore they are considered design choices. The amount of eccentricity to a shaft and this wall thickness depends on the limitations of the equipment and the desires of the person designing the shaft.

As to claim 49: Morrow discloses a polygonal cross-sectional shape (3:46-49).

As to claim 50: The specification provides no unexpected or surprising results in using limitation; therefore it is considered a design choice. An eccentric shaft having a hexagonal cross sectional shape would naturally have over half the sides thicker since walls adjacent the thicker wall would have thin and thick wall segments. And thus could be counted with either the thick or thin wall segments.

As to claim 51: Morrow discloses a polygonal cross-sectional tube with adjacent sides (3:46-49). The eccentric shaft of Merola would naturally have this limitation in an octagonal shaped shaft.

# Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the prior office action have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mike Chambers whose telephone number is 571-272-4407. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-5:00.

Art Unit: 3711

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gene Kim can be reached on 571-272-4463. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael Chambers Examiner Art Unit 3711

October 14, 2007

EUGENE KIM SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Page 5